



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/790,434

02/27/2004

Xiang Liu

LIU-27-5-18

9785

55169

7590

04/01/2009

BROSEMER, KOLEFAS & ASSOCIATES, LLC (ALU)

1 BETHANY ROAD

BUILDING 4 - SUITE # 58

HAZLET, NJ 07730

EXAMINER

TRAN, DZUNG D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/790,434	Applicant(s) LIU ET AL.	
	Examiner Dzung D. Tran	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1, 17, 19 and 20, the terminology "operate in deep saturation" is vague and indefinite. How deep saturation is the applicant considering as deep saturation? It is unclear where the deep saturation region of the amplifier is? Every claimed limitation must be positively identified.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-15, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Yiannopoulos et al. IEEE Photonics Technology Letters , Vol. 15, No.6,

Art Unit: 2613

June 2003 in view of Cho et al. . IEEE Photonics Technology Letters, Vol. 15, No.1, January 2003.

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 20, as far as Examiner understood, Yiannopoulos discloses in Figure 1, a method/apparatus comprising:

a laser and pulse generator (i.e., LD) for generating an optical signal; and propagating the optical signal through a semiconductor optical amplifier SOA in deep saturation to regulate the amplified optical power (page 861, left column, last paragraph).

Yiannopoulos discloses the signal is a Return Zero signal, he does not specifically disclose the RZ is a phase shift key signal.

Cho, from the same field of endeavor, discloses a RZ-DPSK optical signal that propagating through a semiconductor optical amplifier SOA (see Figure 1, page 162). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to an artisan to include the RZ-DPSK of Cho in the system of Yiannopoulos. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do that in order to reduce SOA cross talk penalty (page 162 of Cho).

Regarding claim 2, as far as Examiner understood, Yiannopoulos discloses wherein the amplified optical power is regulated to about the saturation output power of the SOA (page 861, left column).

Regarding claim 3, as far as Examiner understood, Yiannopoulos discloses wherein the gain recovery time of the optical amplifier is larger than the bit period of the optical signal (page 862).

Regarding claim 4, as far as Examiner understood, Yiannopoulos discloses wherein the optical signal has a data-independent intensity profile (page 861, the optical signal operate at 1550 nm).

Regarding claim 5, as far as Examiner understood, Cho discloses wherein the optical signal is an RZ-DPSK signal (page 162).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, as far as Examiner understood, Cho discloses the input power to the SOA can be control (see page 162), therefore, the ratio of ΔP_{out} (dB)/ ΔP_{in} (dB) of the optical amplifier can be controlled to have the result of less than about 0.25.

Regarding claim 11, as far as Examiner understood, Yiannopoulos discloses wherein the gain recovery time of the optical amplifier is larger than the bit period of the optical signal (page 862).

Regarding claim 12, as far as Examiner understood, Cho discloses wherein the optical signal is an RZ-DPSK signal (page 162).

Regarding claim 19, as far as Examiner understood, Yiannopoulos discloses in Figure 1, an optical signal processor apparatus comprising:

a semiconductor optical amplifier (i.e., SOA)

wherein the system is adapted to transmit the optical signal such that the optical amplifier SOA in deep saturation to regulate the amplified optical power (page 861, left column, last paragraph).

Yiannopoulos differs from claim 19 of the present invention in that he does not specifically disclose a plurality of semiconductor optical amplifiers. However, whether

Art Unit: 2613

the apparatus comprises one SOA for equalizing one channel or a plurality SOAs for equalizing a plurality channels is merely an engineering design choices. Examiner also take an official notice that the optical comprises a a plurality of semiconductor optical amplifiers is well known in the art.

Regarding claims 6-8 and 13-15, as far as Examiner understood, Cho discloses wherein the optical signal is a RZ-DPSK signal (page 162). Furthermore, whether the DPSK signal is a $\pi/2$ -DPSK signal or constant-intensity DPSK signal is merely an engineering design choices (for example Wei et al. discloses on IEEE Photonics Technology Letters , Vol. 15, No. 11, November 2003, page 1639, $\pi/2$ -DPSK signal can use the same receiver that DPSK uses).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 17, 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dzung D Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3025. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 7:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2613

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan, can be reached on (571) 272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dzung Tran
03/29/2009

/Dzung D Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2613